NEW CHRISTIAN

SEPT. - OCT. 1960

THE CONGO AND THE "FREE" WORLD

By Louise Harding

THE COLD WAR MUST GO

WORLD INTELLIGENCE

"HIS BODY BROKEN"

By Kenneth Leslie

☆ ★ ☆

Vol. XIII, No. 5

30 Cents

THE CONGO AND THE "FREE" WORLD

By Louise Harding

Some Recent History:

On Aug. 8, a resolution was adopted by the Security Council of the "United" Nations, reaffirming that

"the United Nations forces in the Congo will not be a party to or in any way interfere with the outcome of any internal conflict, constitutional or otherwise.

When Patrice Lumumba was elected Premier, Tshombe's party (centered in the Katanga region) held one post in the eight-post cabinet. Formal independence day was June 30, after signature of a treaty by which it was stipulated that Belgian troops should intervene in the Congo only upon express request of the new government.

Belgium violated the treaty, and the Lumumba government sent a communication to the UN stating that no such request was ever made, Further, that

"The real cause of most of the disturbances can be found in colonial machinations. We accuse the Belgian Government of having carefully prepared the secession of the Katanga with a view to maintaining a hold on our country . . .

The overwhelming majority of the Katanga population is opposed to secession . . . "

It is reported that about 60% of the uranium available to the "free world comes from Katanga province, where US capital investment is 80 million dollars. Moise Tshombe, head of the secession movement, has been described by the Wall Street Journal as "a friend of the big mining companies."

July 15, Lumumba sent a message to Khrushchev, asking him to keep close watch over the development of the Congo situation:

"It is possible that we may have to ask for the Soviet Union's intervention should the Western camp not stop its aggression against the sovereignity of the Republic of the Congo . . . "

The reply concluded:

"The demand of the Soviet Union is simple. Hands off the Republic of Congo."

UN ordered the withdrawal of the Belgium troops (a demand not yet completely complied with) and SF Chr. (July 23) declraed Lumumba considered the decree "a great victory for our republic." He said he would withdraw his appeal for Soviet armed help.

The San Francisco Chronicle in a Moscow dispatch of July 24 announced:

"Pravda said today 'American magnates stand behind the Belgian aggressors" in the Congo, and singled out the Rockefeller family.

"The Communist party newspaper asserted the Rockefeller family bought 600,000 shares in 1950 in Belgium's largest min-

ing company in the Congo's Katanga province . . . The Rockefellers do not want to let such riches as Katanga province out of their hands."

I. F. Stone's Weekly (Sept. 19) copies from a report of the House Foreign Affairs Com., Staff Memo. on the Republic of the Congo, Aug. 24, p.45, as follows:—

"*Key to the Confusion in the Congo.*

"The CONAKAT (Confederation des Associations du Katanga) is a party representing the bulk of the tribes native to Katanga, but under very strong white influence. The CONAKAT was originally a tribal association, but was transformed into a political party in no small measure as a result of intervention by white colons with the assistance of many officials of union Miniere and some of the administration . . . Under white influence, the CONAKAT has also developed separatist tendencies, and has been suspected of the intention to participate in a white sponsored coup d'etat to create a separate Katanga state. Its leader is Moise Tshombe."

Also, The Weekly quotes the Jugoslavian delegate to the Security Council, Sept. 9, in regard to the failure to send UN troops into Katanga at the very beginning of UN action in The Congo:—

> "Because of a certain interpretation of non-interference . . . the Command of the UN forces has not found sufficient necessary and indispensable ways of preventing military and other outside help from being given to the secessionist ring-leaders . . . All military equipment put at the disposal of these people should be confiscated . . . Foreign personnel should be removed from each and every local formation."

And an excerpt from NY Times, Sept. 5, on Gov. Rockefeller's appearance on ABC's Open Hearing, Sept. 4:—

> "Asked if the Congo would be 'worth going through another Korea,' the Governor answered: 'I think "freedom is indivisible . . . We have got to be ready to fight for it whether it is in Korea or Hungary or Congo . . . We have got to be ready to protect the forces of freedom.' "

—The foregoing disclosure of the Rockefeller interests in "freedom" in the Congo, throws some light—to this reporter at least—on the zeal of US reactionaries to restore "liberty" to socialist-governed Hungary—where the Eszterhazy family used to own 750,000 acres of land (now possessed by the formerly landless peasants), and the Roman Catholic Church held even more.

Some Significant Happenings:

Sept. 6 UN seized Leopoldville, and the main airports. "The closing of the airfields to all but UN traffic stranded Lumumba's army commander, Gen. Victor Lunduiu, in Luluabourg, from where he had directed the civil war against Baluba tribesmen

fighting the Congolese army with bows and arrows.

Sept. 7 (Reuters)—"A planeload of nine tons of arms for the army of rebel Katanga province arrived in Elisabethville today from Belgium.

Sept. 8, United Nations—Secy. Gen. Dag Hammarskjold asked the Security Council today to affirm its declaration that all member countries must refrain from interference in the Congo. . . . The growing gravity of the situation . . . he said, may necessitate the temporary disarming of some Congolese military units. The Secy. General apparently referred to elements of the Congolese 'force publique' which earlier mutinied against its Belgian officers."

(The troops are said to have rebelled against most-brutal treatment and starvation (or no) pay.—L.H.

Sept. 8, Lumumba denied he was a Communist, and attacked what he called propaganda of the Roman Catholic Church.

"United Nations' troops continued to control the country's airports . . . Word from Elizabethville, in secessionist Katanga province, was that the action had stopped the Russian airlift of Lumumba troops.

Eisenhower said that if it was true that Soviet military personnel were flying planes (bringing in supplies—which some claimed, without proof, to be military) then the Russians were violating the UN "strict principles regarding foreign military intervention in the Congo or in any country."—No warning from Eisenhower to Belgium.

(Lumumba had again requested Russian aid. It was fortunate for the American colonists seeking independence from Britain, and who got assistance from Lawayette, that these Eisenhower principles against "meddling" were not then being enforced.)

Sept. 8, SF Chronicle: Leopoldville, AP—"Congolese Premier Patrice Lumumba called tonight for United Nations forces to get out of his country unless UN policies are sharply revised.

Lumumba returned to his attacks against the UN after winning a surprisingly lop-sided vote of confidence from The Congo Senate. He won similar support from the Chamber of Deputies yesterday.

"Lumumba charged that the UN was obstructing his government by closing down its radio station and airports. He denounced what he called a campaign of hate against The Congo."

The Senate vote of confidence was 41-2.

By T-V, Lumumba said: "Considering that the central government is capable of assuring the protection of life and property throughout the national territory with the collaboration of the armies of African nations, (it) envisages the retreat in the immediate future of the armed forces of the United Nations in the event they continue to obstruct the action of the government as they are at present . . . "

(The U.N. shut down the airfields to block reported ferrying of Congolese soldiers in Soviet planes to the fighting in Kasai province (with its great diamond fields.—LH).

"Thanking the Soviet Union sincerely for its help, Lumumba said it was offered by Moscow without political conditions. 'We will accept help from France, from Britain, from all the world if there are no political conditions,' he said."

Sept. 8—Hammarskjold warned Belgium against interference in the internal affairs of The Congo, but no active steps were taken to hamper its bringing in men and military supplies.

Sept. 13, UPI—"Premier Patrice Lumumba, arrested for three hours yesterday by the army, appeared before a joint session of the Congolese parliament tonight and won a vote of 'full confidence' . . . Chamber president Joseph Kasongo, who presided, said there were 116 members present, five more than a quorum, but reporters counted only 94. (What "reporters"?—LH).

Sept. 16—20 members of Lumumba's personal staff were arrested by Congolese troops. "And a new power in the Congo Republic, Army Chief of Staff Joseph Mobutu, also sent Communist envoys packing as the bitter internal political dispute seemed to be resolving in his (Lumumba's) favor . . . Mobutu also banned a scheduled meeting of Parliament, *which has been inclined* to string along with Lumumba." (AP, Reuters and UPI).

Sept. 17, Item in Hearst's Examiner, headed Black "Strongman" (that has since become the current title given Mobutu by the reactionary press and radio—how they hate to be honest and say dictator");—"Army Chief of Staff Col. Joseph Mobutu said today he would not tolerate any Communist or other subversive activities in the country which he has taken over in the latest of a series of coups d'etat." One of the moves decided upon by Mobutu was, "to block the airfield at Leopoldville if Soviet Ilyushin planes now stationed in Stanleyville try to fly pro-Lumumba soldiers into the capital." Next: "bring up further reinforcements from the south to strengthen his hold on the country."

At the UN, Sept. 17, the Security Council, over Russia's veto, summoned the General Assembly into emergency session on The Congo crisis. Soviet Deputy For. Minister Zorin declared that a decision for such an emergency assembly session would be illegal unless five permanent members of the council voted for it (which they did not: Russia was against, French abstained. But that would not make the slighest difference.—LH).

Sept. 20, (SF Chr. item) "Strongman Col. Joseph Mobutu today formed a technical 'high commission' to govern The Congo till the end of the year, and warned ousted Premier Patrice Lumumba he would be arrested if he tried to fly to the United Nations." . . . Lumumba held press conference at which he rejected a plan to accept some post in a new cabinet, declaring he

was still premier. "Lumumba also accused the United States of interference."

A radio report said the seceding southern Congo alleged-new government was renewing the cancelled commercial relations with South Africa; what a step for any dark-skinned people to take!

Sept. 21, UPI—"Strongman" Mobutu disclosed he had demanded withdrawal of Ghana and Guinea troops from the Congo because those UN-force members were "interfering in internal affairs" (they were sympathetic to Lumumba—LH).

Sept. 22, Leopoldville, NYT Service. "Premier Designate Joseph Ileo, named Lumumba's successor by Kasavubu almost three weeks ago, repeated charges made earlier by Kasavubu and Mobutu that Ghannaian and Guinean troops were blocking the arrest of Lumumba."

Sept. 23 — AP, UPI, United Nations — "President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana today asked the United Nations to set up a Monroe Doctrine for Africa and make it out of bounds to the 'suicidal' East-West cold war.

"Nkrumah . . . also told the General Assembly that the UN Congo command should be changed 'forthwith' for one that will support deposed pro-Russian Premier Patrice Lumumba." (Lumumba was not "pro-Russian" until he was forced to call on any country for help, that would not attempt to dictate policy. That word was interpolated—LH).

"U.S. Secy of State Christian A. Herter retorted that Nkrumah 'marked himself as being very definitely in what might be called the Soviet bloc.'

"Nkrumah said that the trouble stemmed from the UN force making the mistake of trying 'at one and the same time to preserve law and order and to be neutral between the legal authorities and the law breakers."

How did the Army revolt come about, which installed a dictator in Lumumba's place? The answer is simple. With the country riven by cartelist-promoted splits, Lumumba tied hand and foot by the illegal proceedings of Hammarskjold, and industry shut down because of protracted war, the legitimate government was unable to meet Army payrolls. The UN could, and *did*, meet them. (By the way, how many of our citizens know that the United States today pays the entire bill for the Army of Jordan?—How about the Monroe Doctrine?

I. F. Stone (Sept. 19) is of the opinion that Lumumba is "the Congo's one more-than-tribal national leader." Other boundaries might be more rational, but "the Africans could not stand aside and allow Belgian intrigue with Western aid to detach its richest portions in Katanga and Kasai for a new kind of colonial empire, leaving the rest in hopeless poverty for a long time to come."

It is announced that USA means to appropriate, to "aid" the

African countries, not the mere $100 millions previously spoken of, but six times that amount.—Not to influence the policy of any small African nation, of course, but to guide it safely into the kind of "democracy" which now governs USA.

The foregoing has been set forth in such detail, because the incidents narrated illustrate so clearly what has been brought about largely by US intervention in The Congo. It is the same pattern that was followed in Korea, in Taiwan, in Siam—anywhere that Monopoly Capitalism came into competition with Communism (Socialism): viz., set up a dictatorship, no matter how unconscionable, and bribe the top few to enter and remain in the camp of US cartelists.

The story also shows how little excuse there was for the tactics followed by the United States—which, as Dean Rusk (former under-secy. of State) honestly declared, IS the United States.

THE COLD WAR MUST GO

By the Editor

The Importance of Tolerance:

You may be a member of one of the classic world religions or you may simply knock on wood in deference to the powers that run the universe. You may be a Buddist or a Baptist or a Shintoist. You may believe in the Cross or in the Crescent or in a horseshoe. But, presuming you do believe in something, presuming that you *must* believe in it, whether in a rabbit's foot or a rabbi's teaching, then your belief is not a luxury; it is needed in the fabric of your life, it is *vitally necessary* to you.

It may be a lie to someone else or just a comforting bed-time story. To you it is the truth without which you would die. For you it is the way, the shape, the texture of your life, the very veins through which your life blood flows.

Now do you see how important *my* tolerance for *your* way of life becomes, how important it is that the state which is all of us should keep its hands off this aspect of your life, how important the Bill of Rights which is the Bill of Tolerance becomes?

Yes, you need your creed if your life is wrapped up in your creed, if you eat and love and earn according to your creed, if its song clutches at your heart and sings itself through your hours of sorrow and loneliness.

If the music, the art, the literature of your creed guides and inspires your daily life, then indeed you understand the glorious heritage of tolerance in a land of tolerance. Yes, even if your belief be a passionate disbelief, and if your disbelief should be-

come a condition of your life so that you could not bear to think of returning to what you may call superstition, even then you must give thanks for a bulwark of tolerance.

When does the bulwark of tolerance break down? When does it stand? Tolerance stands and is in no danger of breaking down where all beliefs disappear. Tolerance remains where complete indifference reigns.

Tolerance remains too where beliefs are various and vigorous in kind. Where convinced Jews and Christians and atheists live together in a community there must be tolerance if there is not to be bloodshed. In fact here is the basis of American tolerance. Our forebears were strong believers and strong disbelievers from Jonathan Edwards to Bob Ingersoll and even down to Bryan and Clarence Darrow. Yesterday we had men with conviction who were willing to defend their convictions in open forum and who did their best to demolish their opponents' arguments in the true spirit of tolerance. For, look you, tolerance meant listening to the other side.

But today a different spirit is abroad, a spirit which says that one may not attack religion, especially that one may not attack ecclesiastical institutions or their beliefs or practices or the beliefs and practices of free enterprise. And right here intolerance pushes its ugly head into the tent of democracy.

The condition for the appearance of this invasion of intolerance is the presence of one single strong faith in the midst of a surrounding indifference. The strong faith in America is the faith in Capitalism or Free Enterprise and it has allied itself with the three sectarian faiths all of which profess belief in "God", and which follow the leadership of Rome.

It used to be the privilege of Americans to believe or disbelieve in God. Now however it has become the privilege of Americans to believe in God each in his own way and to worship as he pleases, but not at all to disbelieve in God. This is not tolerance. It is intolerance under the appearance of tolerance. It is the thin edge of the wedge of clerical fascism. There have been even attempts to harness the Constitution through the use of the phrase "under God" to a particular religious vehicle or group of vehicles, always in the service of Free Enterprise which has become Cartel Capitalism. More subtly and with scarcely noticeable motions the National Conference of Christians and Jews has operated in the same interest. This became obvious at the time of the Spanish Civil War when the truth was hidden from the American people in deference to the eagerly sought goodwill of the Catholic Bishops. National Radio and TV grids work to the same end. Even such liberal journals as the *New Republic* frowns upon the introduction of the "religious issue" into the Kennedy-Nixon campaign. Yet it might be wiser to seize the religious nettle firmly and ask whether or not Nixon might perhaps be a better servant

of the Vatican than Kennedy. We are reduced to that. If the Vatican should show itself to be an indispensable ally of Cartel Imperialism then we may be sure that Nixon will do its bidding.

The Roman Catholic Church, albeit the best organized, is not the only religious body defending capitalism. From the fundamentalist sects to sophisticated churchmen Protestantism furnishes willing helpers and Judaism does its part. There are exceptions in all three faiths but the exceptions are negligible. The brains as well as the driving power in this tri-faith are contributed by the Romans. With Nixon or with Kennedy the Romans will win.

Liberal Indifference Helps Rome:

By simply taking up the slack of her lines attached to the wharf a child can bring the Queen Elizabeth to a safe mooring. So by taking up the slack lines of indifference the ship of state can be brought to a safe mooring at the Vatican berth by a mere handful of men who know what they want and are willing to work for it. All that is needed is the surrounding indifference which has become characteristic of our 'liberalism'.

It might be supposed that the Fundamentalist Sects would be opposed to Rome, but this opposition has been largely neutralized by the Roman strategy of the Christian Front in the war against atheistic communism, and later by the Christian Jewish Front in the same war. By default of other effective leadership Rome has pretty well taken charge of this crusade. The Roman strategy has been successful to the extent that we are now confronted in the presidential campaign with the choice of a born Roman and a man who agrees with him on all vital issues.

So this is the condition we mentioned, the condition calling for intolerance which is the prelude to fascism. Indifference is prevalent *except* in one or a few powerful and ambitious and pretentious sects or groups, who have in one way or another identified their approved kind of life with the American way of life. They propose to place the pattern of their thinking upon America and to cut America permanently to that pattern. And (this is the point) they propose to do this in advance of the issues involved being discussed on their own merits. They propose to do this not by persuasion in open debate but by closure, by the sergeant-at-arms throwing the opposition out of court. We should not be surprised later when one of these sects manages to ditch its opportunist fellow-travellers and take short-cuts to power.

We once heard Martin Dies identify the American way of life with the religion of Capitalism. He did not argue the point; and it is no longer argued. It is not considered debateable. We say religion of Capitalism advisedly. It has become a religion; for when a way of life takes such a hold on a man's thought and affection that he cannot conceive of existence apart from it, then

that way has become for him the strait and narrow way of his religion.

Listening to Martin Dies we felt here was a weak man; no Jonathan Edwards, no Bob Ingersoll. Here was no logic, no argument, no intellectual engagement with an enemy. And we thought: A road without logic, without argument, without controversy is a road out of democracy into totalitarianism. Its end is clerical fascism. And our thoughts run along the same road today when we listen to the radio commentator or read the average editorial. There is no debate. The Cold War is not a debate. It is the death of democracy.

Cold War Freezes UN:

The Cold War is destructive too of the United Nations because you cannot have a United Nations within which is a dedicated disuniting agent. And that is what the Cold War is, a powerful agent holding the nations apart. The Cold War does two things: it forbids any approach toward a meeting of minds between East and West; and it attempts the forceful control of opinion within the confines of the East and the West respectively. Both America and Russia are closed societies, but America was once an open society and becomes year by year more closed, whereas Russia, beginning as a closed society, becomes year by year more open. The tremendous emphasis placed upon education including humanist education by the Russian leaders has eventuated in a society which must bring to Russian youth "the open and inquiring mind;" whereas since the death of Roosevelt the windows and doors of the mind have been closing in America.

From Conscience to Constable:

Opinion makes law. The advance of man is the advance of law. Law is crystallized general opinion. Law, once made by the majority, binds the minority. What makes opinion? Debate, argument, persuasion! Therefore basic to law is free debate. Out of free controversy, sifting of facts and opinions, comes a concensus of opinion and that concensus gradually becomes strong enough to get onto the statutes to be enforced by the constable.

From conscience to constable is a long way and it is the genius of any kind of government that calls itself democratic to keep conscience free and untramelled, to keep hands off conscience. This is not merely a right; it is the indispensable condition of a democracy. And it is no mere private right or privilege; it includes a positive privilege of public utterance of this private judgment.

Therefore the only remedy for the present intolerance would be a renewed activation of controversy which would remove attention from personalities and groups totheir opinions, objectively considered. It is strange when you think of it that the age of intolerance coincides with the age of indifference, the age of "So what?" That is because in the midst of the indifference there is a determin-

ed Conference of Bishops with its innumerable societies and sodalities and leagues and bands and legions and cohorts et cetera, all straining t omake America Catholic. This vast organization is on its way and it is going places and the surrounding sea of "liberal" indifference is friendly to its venture.

Heads I Win, Tails You Lose:

There will be enough Catholics in Nixon's corner during the coming fight so that in case he should win the Roman cause would not suffer.

The opposition, the real opposition (Communism and every idea associated with it) has been read out of court and off the field by both contestants and by the entire communications media.

One thing Kennedy and Nixon both agree on in their current TV debate: Continue the domestic crack-down on the local Communists, and continue the Cold War in foreign policy. In other words they both favor a closure on debate, on controversy, and therefore on real democracy.

Meanwhile CHINA, one fifth of the globe, is excluded from the United Nations. Every UN vote, every UN decision is vitiated by this exclusion. The UN is no UN without China. The exclusion of China is the latest fruit of the Cold War, early fruit of which were Hitler's genocidal crusade agains tthe Jew and the Slav and Franco's murder of the new-born Spanish democracy. The Cold War binds all these events and thousands of others together and leads them to an inevitable conclusion: clerical fascism in America and hot war in a world which can afford no more hot wars.

Stop War on China Now!

This is why the Cold War must be stopped; and one of the quickest ways to stop it is to let China take her place in the Security Council as one of the permanent members as was intended in the beginning. In fact we may say that unless this is done there will be little sense doing any other things; this is basic, this is a long overdue rectification. The war on China through Formosa must cease forthwith. The Chinese must come to the United Nations *as of right.* Never mind saving face for the United States or anyone else! It is too late for that. China cannot, will not wait much longer. With her entrance, but not without it, the Cold War can be brought to a close; the world can move forward out of the present impasse; mankind can learn to accept differences; friendship can come to the peoples and children can sleep without fear.

The United States is guilty of starting the Cold War at San Francisco and at Fulton and constantly re-starting the Cold War by brinkmanship, and is guilty of carrying on a hot war against all the socialist countries through the CIA and particularly against China through Formosa and the US Seventh Fleet. One

aspect of these hot and cold wars is that they are continuations of the anathema against Tolerance pronounced long ago by the ecclesiastical Power.

As we write we watched TV tonight, a program dealing with the religious question in the Kennedy-Nixon contest for the presidency of the United States. It was a perfect example of what we mean by intolerance. There was a complete absence of controversy. The Cold War was not mentioned. The hot wars of rebellion in Algeria, in the near East and in the far East were not touched upon. The U2 spy flight was not mentioned. The general policies of Kennedy were approved. The putative effect of his religion upon his views on divorce or birth control were discussed, but the fact that his religion gave him a mandate to carry on the Cold War with increasing vigor, the important fact about his religion was entirely ignored. We take that for granted. That has become the all-embracing faith of all faiths, Catholic, Jew, and Protestant. Kennedy *and* Nixon. Demorepublicanism. For the big issue before the people of the United States, the issue of war and peace they are of one single mind and that is a mind for war if necessary to gain the Pax Americana.

Presiding over the Assembly of the UN are a Secretary-General a President, and Andrew Cordier, a permanent American factotum who pretty well runs the UN apparatus. Whatever may be said of this arrangement it cannot be said that it reflects the real nature of the world today split as it is between the socialist and anti-socialist nations and the neutral nations. If there is to be peace, if there is to be negotiation, it must be among these groups, and therefore each group must be represented in the UN and on its leading committees. That these three groups should always be represented should become a cardinal principle of the UN. It is unlikely that China would even consent to join the UN as it is at present constituted. We may not like the world to be split up among socialist and anti-socialist nations and nations that are neither capitalist nor socialist, but we must face the fact that that is the way things are. If we were all alike there would be no need for a UN, there would be no need for negotiation, but we are not all alike. We differ widely. We differ up to the point of a hot war we dare not wage, and therefore we are forced by that very threat of war to talk to each other and seek out and find areas of agreement with each other. This we can do because we must do it.

WORLD INTELLIGENCE

Red Carpet for Khrushchev:

"Uninvited, unwanted and unwelcome" Time Magazine called Khrushchev. "In coming here as a UN delegate, your intentions are all bad. You can leave any time and good riddance," said Hearst Headline Service, while the Journal-American made its headline, HATE ROARS OVER CITY LIKE A PENT-UP FLOOD.

But the New Rochelle Standard-Star scraped bottom with a banner headline: NIKITA, (a picture of a RAT) SCURRIES ASHORE.

Et cetera et cetera et cetera ad nauseam.

The US State Department asked television networks to "Show restraint" on Khrushchev; the networks were peeved because they needed no nudging along this line. No matter, Khrushchev steals the show wherever he appears, and he turns up in the oddest places. He has personality plus that draws the camera and the crowd. He made one of the best speeches he ever made at the UN, not attacking the UN as Ike averred, but stating the conditions under which it could live; something along the lines of his suggestion will have to be done or the UN will capsize from too much weight in the starboard hold. Rusk's saying, "The UN is the US," is too true, and it must be corrected.

It was thrilling to watch the African representatives march into the hall of the UN. We hope there were plenty of dixiecrats watching. And most inspiring it was to listen to the Ghana representative Quaison-Sackey as he defended the right of Congo to seek help from outside to establish its authority and to deal with those who with Belgian help defy that authority.

"Since July 11 Belgium has flown in over a hundred tons of arms, including mortars, sub-machine guns and FM automatic rifles. Twenty-five Belgian Air Force planes with their crews have been placed at the disposal of the Tshombe government. Eighty-nine Belgian officers and NCO's have been formally seconded to the Tshombe forces and 326 Belgian officers and NCO's are now serving in the Tshombe army as volunteers. This action by Belgium is in complete disregard of the Security Council resolutions. The Government of Ghana cannot believe that Belgium would act in this fashion unless it had been assured of some outside support. If this is so, the situation is one of great gravity in that it implies that at least *one of the permanent members of the Security Council is assisting Belgium to deny the orders of the Council.*" *(Our emphasis).* Britain and the United States are the two members of the Security Council which are large partners with Belgium in Katanga province. Elsewhere in

this issue Louise Harding tells in detail and chronologically the story of the Congo.

Stephen H. Fritchman, pastor of the First Unitarian Church, Los Angeles, has the courage of a true prophet. He has just returned from a trip to Tokyo and Hiroshima, where he attended Gensuikyo, the Japanese peace movement associated with the organization against A and H bombs. We wish we had space to publish in full his address "The Choice Is Ours" which he made after returning. In it he speaks of "the ignorance and the complacency of Americans who know little or nothing of the anger of the Japanese people at the encroachment of the American bases and planes on their peaceful livelihoods and existence. One is not the same after hearing them . . . " He visited the Atomic Victims Hospital where 80 victims died last year. He makes a tremendous plea *for peace and for an end to human exploitation.* Those who exclude this man from the Christian category are not servants of Christ but of anti Christ.

The "ignorance and complacency" which Fritchman talks of extend up into Canada. "The Equity" published at Shawville, Quebec has a recent editorial headed "WELL I'LL BE!" part of which reads, "You could have knocked us over with a feather when one of our readers let us know that they, personally, want Canada to have nuclear weapons and they wonder why we are against it . . . Surely few people really think that our having atomic weapons would add fright to a potential enemy already nervous with the knowledge that itchy-fingered generals to our south have enough atomic bombs to wipe out civilization . . . If Canada accepts nuclear weapons that is the thin edge of the wedge . . . we are agreeing to atomic warfare as a means of settling differences."

"And when we say the thin edge of the wedge," the editorial continues, "do you know what monstrous plans are out towards the thicker edge? Have you heard of Biological and Chemical Warfare? No horror movie, no science fiction will ever approach the realities of Biological and Chemical Warfare which are now being schemed and plotted . . . " Bravo "The Equity"!

And now let us turn from light to darkness and examine a book that scares the daylights out of us: William S. Schlamm's "GERMANY AND THE EAST-WEST CRISIS", a plea for the resurgence of German power.

This frightening book is a diabolical argument for an alliance between USA and Germany. By Germany the author means all Germany East and West represented by Bonn exclusively. A

purposeful alliance between USA and Germany will involve the liberation "of 17 million Germans who live under repacious Soviet oppression."

To quote some of its pregnant passages: " . . . an American peace treaty with Germany will have to establish the fact that German sovereignty covers all territory that was internationally recognized as German by all the powers of the world . . . the day before Adolf Hitler took power." "It must articulate the basic claim of Germany, the United States, and the entire West against the Soviet Union: that Soviet troops must cease the illegal occupation of the eastern parts of sovereign Germany." "Nothing short of a formal peace treaty will do—an act, that is, prepared in the limelight of open international negotiations and endorsed by the United States Senate." "In other words," says Schlamm, "I suggest a policy that is diametrically opposed to the conduct advocated by Walter Lippann and George F. Kennan." They favor recognition of the *status quo.* "I contend that any United States guarantee of the *status quo* is tantamount to America's resignation, first, as a world power and then, in fast consequence as a free nation." This author favors "an alliance which makes Germany America's senior partner on the Continent and openly pronounces as its goal the restoration of German sovereignty over all German territory." " . . . the United States and Germany would calmly proceed with a war of nerves that, indeed, includes the risks of real war."

Here is a plea for brinkmanship a la the late John Foster Dulles. Even further, it advocates a preventive war. "Were I persuaded that the Soviets intend to shower us with intercontinental missiles on December 7, 1959, I would most fervently advocate that we disable them, by what is called "preventive war' *before* that date." But he is not so persuaded; on the contrary he thinks the Soviets are deathly afraid of an all-out conflagration. So he suggests "an increasingly impressive posture of military might" and an "increasingly forceful and entirely frank political offensive that demands a Soviet retreat from the obvious areas of intolerable irritation." But his argument fails to take account of Soviet growth during the period of our military development.

In January, 1958, 9,253 scientists of 44 nations solemnly petitioned the United Nations demanding the immediate cessation of atomic test explosions. Schlamm calls it a "prank". Albert Schweitzer in opposing bomb tests is expressing "some superstitious and, in fact, some primordial horror about the perils of science." "Schweizer (is) a man whose specialty is the emotional generalities of 'humanism'." And he doesn't know what he is talking about. Natural scientists Schlamm says cannot weigh moral issues since they deal in quantitative measurements. They might answer that quantity becomes quality when punishment becomes suicide; but they are not permitted to answer.

On March 11, 1959, President Eisenhower declared, "We certainly are not going to fight a ground war in Europe." Thus Mr. Eisenhower has torn up the very concept of NATO. "The West's undoing is its craving for peace . . . communism *thrives* on peace, *wants* peace, *triumphs* in peace . . . The West, to survive at all must be *believably* willing to wage war."

On another page where the author is interpreting the nature of communism he says "communism is a mutation of the *mind*, a *spiritual* venture, the synthesis of several centuries of all the heretical but *intellectual* unrest of history." We are not permitted to quote except briefly, but the point he tries to make is this: Communism is the end result of the worship of science or *scientism*. It is the final Promethean heresy. It is the ultimate attempt of man to drive God out of the world. It is a mental thing. But, strangely, *the antidote is not mental;* it is material; it is the threat, the believable threat of war. It is the old argument *ad crucem*, the appeal to force. Communism must be rolled back, and for this the West must be strong. Since communism is now strong, the West must become stronger. For this purpose Germany (the whole of Germany) is necessary to the United States as a senior partner in Europe. Spain and Turkey are to be junior partners, and England too if she remains strong. It will be nice to have the goodwill of France and Denmark, but the core, the heart of European defence against Bolshevism is (as it always was) Germany. So he pleads for a firm alliance between the United States and Germany. His logic is good, if one accepts the logic of Nixon-Kennedy, which is that we must build strength *against* Russia. It is disastrous of one accepts the logic of peaceful co-existence, a bad word in this man's book, whose whole book is bad words in our book.

In this connection let us quote from the "Frankfurter Rundschau", a leading West German newspaper, August 21st, 1960, as reprinted in the Democratic German Report:

"In the past the German army has played a disastrous role in German politics. This weekend, the revived German General Staff has taken the first step towards calling down nemesis once again on the German people. The leadership of the Federal Army has published a memorandum calling for conscription, NATO membership, and atom arms for the Federal Army, as the foundations for effective defence.

Heusinger, Ruge, Kammhuber and Zerbel, who all held responsible posts in Adof Hitler's Wehrmacht, have thus led the Federal Army along a path which disregards the lessons taught by two total catastrophes . . . "

"Put concisely, this is the same German evil spirit which we started to overcome after 1945, but which dominates West Germany again today.

"One needs not be a prophet to see where this leads . . . in the Weimar Republic the Generals intervened in politics in opposition to the government, while today they are doing it with the approval and support of the government."

On August 26, ADENAUER ANNOUNCED THAT HE "AGREES FULLY" WITH THE MEMORANDUM PUBLISHED BY THE NAZI GENERALS.

It is no wonder that the Russians who were trampled by the Nazi beast are filled with terror when they see that NATO spells NAZI, and especially when they see that Hitler's Counsellor, Dr. Hans Globke, is now State Secretary of Adenauer.

The US has been successful again in postponing for another year discussion in the UN on the question of China's being admitted to the UN. Thus the shame and humiliation of a great organization are perpetuated.

SHALL WE GO ON?

We are grateful for subscriptions renewed and for contributions. Especially for contributions, as these enable us to send the magazine to many who are unable to subscribe. Some of those who were wont to send us sizable contributions have apparently found themselves unable to continue doing so. Unfortunately we find it difficult to go on. At times it is almost impossible. Rightly or wrongly we feel that our message is important in these days of man's increasing alienation from himself in the West and the successful search for himself in the East. Grace be given us for penitence, grace be given us to admit, nay to beg China to take her rightful place in our UN, grace be given us to make the supreme sacrifice of peace to the world!

"MY BODY BROKEN"

To Frank Starratt

By Kenneth Leslie

The soul is flaming when the hallowed page
Reels incoherent in the prophet's rage;
Symbols and creeds and scriptures little token
Except when being made or being broken .

One cup each day is for that day's endeavour,
One cup to drain and then to break forever;
And if I drain it not but save it up
The wine will spoil, left lying in the cup.

This holy grail, this chalice filled with hours,
Purple for stars and golden for the flowers,
Brimmed now with dark wine, now with amber mead,
Now sweet, now bitter, various to my need,
Passes my lips in ecstasy each day
And at day's end is smashed and thrown away.

We knew a wise man once; yet even he
Would wait the fruiting of the almond tree
And on the instant it was ripe to eat
Would break the shell to taste its bitter sweet.
He let his truth fly forth in winging word;
And wrote no parchment trap for that wild bird !

NEW CHRISTIAN

SEPT. - OCT. 1960

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I. Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etianne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, Elmsdale, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**